THE SVMME OF A DISPVTATION,

BETWEENE Mr. VVALKER Paſtor of *St. Iohn Euangeliſts* in *Watling-ſtreet London*; and a popiſh Prieſt, calling himſelfe *Mr. Smith*, but indeed *Norrice*, aſſiſted by other Prieſts and Papiſts.

HELD IN THE PRESENCE OF ſome worthy Knights; [redacted] other Gentlemen of both Religions.

Printed. 1624.

D 32

Printed. 1823.

The ſumme of a Diſputation betweene Mr. *Walker*, Paſtor of *St. Iohn* Euangeliſts in Watling ſtreet in *London*: And a popiſh Prieſt, calling himſelfe *Mr. Smith*, but indeed *Norrice*, aſſiſted by other Prieſts and Papiſts; May laſt 1623. held in the preſence of ſome worthy Knights, with other Gentlemen of both Religions.

The occaſion of the Diſputation.

SIr *William Harington* Knight, hauing a kinſman of the Romiſh Catholike Reli[illegible] by much reaſoning with him, and many perſwaſions had brought him to wauering, ſo that he ſtood in doubt which was the true religion, and deſired to be ſatisfied. The forenamed Prieſt Mr. *Smith* alias Dr. *Norrice* for the ſettling and hardening of him in the popiſh religion, told him that the proteſtant Church of *England* vnto which he ſeemed to incline, had no faith, neither indeed was it any Church of Chriſt at all: and alſo challenged his kinſman Sir *William Harrington* to bring any Miniſter of the Engliſh Church whatſoeuer into any conuenient place of meeting, and he would by diſputation, and by inuincible arguments proue againſt him before their faces, and in their hearing,

that Engliſh Proteſtants had neither Church nor faith. Sir *william Harrington* did take his offer, vpon condition that he would anſwer to ſuch queſtions as the Diuine which he would bring ſhould propound againſt the Romiſh religion; it was agreed; the day and place appointed. Whereupon Sir *William* requeſting a reuerend Doctor of his acquaintance to take the charge vpon him; he being to preach in his charge vpon a neceſſary occaſion the very day which was appointed: ſent him to Mr. *Welker*, whom he aſſured him to be a man ready for ſuch a purpoſe. And who at the firſt motion vpon a dayes warning embraced the offer, promiſed to come the next day to Sir *William*, and to attend him to the place of meeting, And Sir *William* requeſting him to name before hand ſome queſtions oppoſite to the Romiſh religion which hee would diſ[illegible]vpon againſt the Prieſts; he gaue him theſe three following. 1. *That the preſent Church of Rome is the Whore of Babylon.* 2. *That the Pope is Antichriſt.* 3. *That the Popiſh doctrine of Peters being Biſhop of Rome is a forged fable contrary to the Scriptures.*

Theſe poſitions Sir *William Harrington* ſent to the Prieſt, that he might arme himſelfe for the defence: The next day Mr. *Walker* came to Sir *williams* lodgings to dinner, and accompanied him and Sir *Edward Harwood*, with ſome other Gentlemen to a priuate houſe by the Thames ſide, where they found ſome Romiſh Catholike Gentlemen, and the ſaid *Smith* with other Prieſts. Before they entred into diſputation, Mr. *Smith* alias *Norrice*, called Maſter *Walker* aſide, and deſired that the diſputation might

be

be performed louingly and ſweetly with all mildeneſſe, and without bitter words or byting ſpeeches. Mr. *Walker* anſwered, that he deſired to byte and gall no aduerſary but with ſound reaſons, which do moſt commonly cut to the quicke, ſuch as defend errors: as for other ſpeeches, he promiſed for his part to be milde or ſharpe, according to the behauiour of his Aduerſaries. And thus they proceed to a formall manner of diſputation, the one ſitting downe at the one end of a Table, the other at the other end, and the auditors ſitting along on both ſides, and ſome ſtanding about in a large vpper Parlor. But firſt Mr. *Walker* deſired a Bible, vnto which they might appeale, and by which teſtimonies of Scriptures, which both parties alleaged might bee tried; whereupon there were two Bibles brought, and agreed vpon; the one a vulgar Latine, which the Councell of *Trent*, and the [illegible]le Romiſh Church holds to be moſt authenticall; the other an Engliſh Bible, for the ſtanders by to looke vpon. Then Mr. *Smith* alias *Norrice*, begins firſt with an apologie for himſelfe, telling the Gentlemen that he had of late by reaſon of ſome bodily infirmity, beene forced to take phiſicke, and to vſe a dyet drinke, and therefore if his memory ſhould faile, or if paine in his head ſhould force him to breake off abruptly, deſired them to beare with him, and to haue him excuſed; By which hee ſeemed wiſely to prouide before hand for a leſſe ſhamefull flight, if he found the fight too hot and ſharpe for him to be endured. Mr. *Walker* on the other ſide deſired, that they might goe to it hand to hand, and but one

ſpeake at once for auoiding of confuſion; that the diſputation might be in ſhort ſyllogiſmes: and deſired alſo that the Arguments & the anſwers might be writ downe, for preuenting all falſe relation and miſreports afterward, and withall, did put it to the Aduerſaries choyce, whether he would oppoſe or anſwer firſt? Mr. *Smith* deſired, that hee might firſt diſpute vpon his owne queſtions, and promiſed that afterwards he would anſwer Mr. *Walker*, diſputing vpon his queſtions: It was agreed vpon; And thereupon he putting off his hat, and croſſing his face and breaſt, began to ſpeake to Mr. *Walker* as followeth.

Mr. *Smith*, alias *Norrice*.

Sir, I haue here receiued three queſtions from you, which you haue taken vpon you to proue by Argument, I haue here writtẽ downe, and will relate them vnto you. Firſt you ſay you will proue the Pope to bee Antichriſt: 2. The Church of *Rome* to bee the whore of *Babylon*: 3. That *St. Peter* was not Biſhop of *Rome* as we hold; *Theſe queſtions are ſuch as are not fit to bee named, much leſſe to be diſputed or anſwered; they are deliuered in tearmes very vnſeemely and vnmannerly: for what can be more vnfit or vnſeemely then this*, that you ſhould call the holy father the Pope Antichriſt, and the Church of *Rome* the whore of *Babylon* now in theſe dayes, *When it pleaſeth the Kings Maieſtie to giue the Pope that honour, as to ſend and ſue to his holineſſe for a diſpenſation for the marriage of the Prince his ſonne: I pray you therefore let vs haue no more of theſe queſtions, but let vs haue ſome other, or elſe propound them in other tearmes, as* that the Church of *Rome* is

not

not the true Church or the like: *As you see I haue done, in that I haue vsed milder words in my questions: holding that you Protestants in England,* haue no Church nor Faith.

Mr. *Walker.*

Seeing it is your pleasure thus to speake at large in loose speech, and not in strict Syllogisme, I will answer you in your kinde. First, I maruell that you are not ashamed to slaunder the Kings Maiestie with honouring of the Pope, by suing to him for dispensation, which we all know he will neuer doe; because he hath not onely said, that he is Antichrist, but also publikely in his learned writings proued him so to be, and *the Romish Church to be the whore of Babylon.* I warrant you our King will marry his Son and aske the Pope no leaue, if the other party will aduenture it as well as he. It is most intollerable, that you should so boldly slaunder his Maiestie.

Secondly, for the tearmes of my questions, which you call vnmannerly, they are the same which it pleaseth Gods spirit to vse in the holy Scriptures; and his holinesse hath in his wisedome beene pleased to stile the Pope and Church of *Rome* by the same titles, as I shall quickly proue, if you will vndertake to answer me. And therefore you are too bold to taxe Gods spirit of vnmannerlinesse: But perhaps this is a shift of yours, to put off our disputation vpon these points which pay you home, with a cleanely excuse of vnmannerly tearmes: yet it shall not serue your turne; for the more vnseemly that the questions are, the more disgrace it will be to me, and the more hard taske to proue them:

and

and to you it will be more credit and eaſe to defend the contrary, ſo that this is no excuſe for you at all. Thirdly, your queſtions are more vnmannerly and ſaucy, in that you doe charge vs here at home ſo manifeſtly contrary to common ſenſe, that we haue neither Church nor Faith, when as we beleeue and profeſſe all holy truthes taught in the holy Scriptures, which by your ſelues cannot be denyed to be Gods infallible word. But I pray you let vs leaue all looſe and idle diſcourſes, and come to a ſtrict forme of Diſputation, writing downe the Arguments and anſwers which doe paſſe betweene vs. Your taske which you haue vndertaken is to proue, that we haue no Church nor Faith: let vs heare your arguments briefly.

Mr. Smith.

Well, that we may come quickly and cloſely come home to the matter, let me aske you a queſtion, and doe you anſwer me, that I may ground my Arguments vpon your owne words, and I ſhall quickly proue againſt you my aſſertion, and make the truth of it plainely appeare. Firſt I aske whether the true Catholike Church bee viſible?

M. *Walker.*

The true Catholike Church is not viſible, neither can it be ſeene with eyes of any mortall man on earth.

Mr. Smith.

Marke Gentlemen, hee will deny this Canon: hee ſaith the Catholike Church is not viſible, which I will proue to be againſt all reaſon.

Mr. *Walker.*

Indeed if I ſhould ſay that it were viſible, conſidering

dering it as it now is, I ſhould ſpeake againſt all reaſon; For the greateſt part of it being Saints in heauen are without the reach of mans eyes, and cannot be ſeene.

Mr. Smith.

You doe but equiuocate of purpoſe to decline all Diſputation; you know that I meane, not the Church triumphant in heauen, but the Catholike Church militant on earth.

Mr. *Walker.*

Nay, rather doe you equiuocate or worſe; for to ſay that the Catholike Church is militant on earth is as abſurd, as to ſay that all mankinde, euen the whole vniuerſall race of *Adam* are now liuing on earth, when reaſon and experience teach vs, that the greateſt part are dead, and many alſo yet vnborne: I hope you know that the word Catholike, ſignifies vniuerſall: and therefore the Catholike Church is the vniuerſall company of the Elect and faithfull, and includes in it euery one whoſoeuer hath beene, or is, or ſhall be hereafter a true beleeuing member of Chriſt, and all they cannot bee ſeene at once on earth, becauſe they neuer were altogether on earth. The militant number of them on earth, are the leaſt part of them.

Mr. Smith.

You doe wrangle to auoyde Diſputation; I therefore tell you, that by the Catholike militant Church, I vnderſtand the true Church of Ieſus Chriſt, which all true Chriſtians here on earth ought to heare and obey, as it is the pillar and ground of truth: now anſwer whether you hold that to be viſible or inuiſible?

Mr. *Walker*.

I iudge of your meaning by your words, and therefore I cannot conceiue this Church which you doe ſpeake of, to be the Catholike, that is the vniuerſall Church: for euery true particular Church, in which euery true Chriſtian doth loue, and whereof he is a member, is that which he ought to heare and to obey, becauſe by reaſon of the faithfull and elect which are in it, it is the houſe of God, and the pillar and firmament of truth. Now euery ſuch Church is partly viſible, and partly inuiſible.

Mr. Smith.

How is it viſible, and how is it inuiſible?

Mr. *Walker*.

Euery ſuch true Church hath in it elect and faithfull men, profeſſing outwardly in word, and practiſe true Chriſtian religion, who doe belong to the Catholike Church, and are true liuely members of Chriſt: It hath alſo ſome hypocrites and carnall profeſſors, which doe alſo make an outwatd ſhow and profeſſion of chriſtianity, but are not truely ingraffed into Chriſt, by vnion and communion of the Spirit, neither haue the true holy ſauing Faith, and by conſequent are not members of the true Catholike Church. Now the men who profeſſe religion in the Church, and are the members of it, if we conſider them as they are men, and as they practiſe and performe outward duties of chriſtians, as preaching and hearing of the word, adminiſtring and receiuing the Sacraments publike outward worſhip and ſuch like, they are viſible: But as for the election faith, ſpirituall, and in word graces and

deuotion

deuotion in the one ſort, by which they are indeed true chriſtians, & belong to the Catholike Church: and the hipocriſie and carnall corruption lurking inwardly in the other ſort, by meanes whereof, they are ſeperated from communion with Chriſt in ſpirit, they are things inuiſible, and to be diſcerned ſpiritually, not with bodily eyes. Thus euery true Church is partly inuiſible, to wit, in reſpect of the ſpirituall graces, which make men true Chriſtians indeed; and partly viſible, to wit, in reſpect of the outward profeſſion, common both to elect and reprobates, to faithfull men and hypocrites.

Mr. Smith.

No ſooner was the anſwer giuen but Mr. Smith *as one full of anger, proteſted with vehemency of words, that now he ſaw indeed, there was neither Church nor Faith among Proteſtants; they were all ſo contrary among themſelues, neuer agreeing together in any opinion: He affirmed to the ſtanders by, that Doctor* Whitakers, *Doctor* Reignolds, *Mr.* Perkins, *and many other chiefe Prrteſtants did euer grant, that the true Catholike Church was viſible. Another Prieſt ſitting by, ſcornefully repeated the name of* Perkins, *and ſpake of him as of a pocre ſilly man, not worthy to be counted among the learned.*

Mr. *Walker.*

Mr. *Walker* moued with the falſhood of the one, and the ſcorne of the other, firſt anſwered the ſcorner, that none could count Mr. *Perkins* ſilly and vnlearned, but either out of ignorance or wilfull mallice: and that he knew it to be the faſhion of popiſh Prieſts, outwardly to ſleight & vilifie before the people, ſuch as do moſt cut and gall them. To Mr. *Smith*

he answered, that if he would grant that Protestants haue a true Church, and the true faith, as truely as that which he affirmed of Doctor *whitakers* and the rest was false, he would desire no more for the victorie: Yea (saith hee) if you haue read Doctor *whitakers*, you know that he holds as I doe; and that you wilfully and falsely father on him things vntrue.

Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith *enraged with this answer, protested what he had said was true, and the more to perswade the standers by, he added more specially, that Doctor* Whitakers *doth in his writings maintaine, that the whole essence of the true Church, consists onely in the true preaching of the word, and the right administration of the Sacraments which are things visible.*

Mr. *Walker.*

Sir I doe not loue to contend by oathes and protestations, but by proofes. I will here write downe your words (which he did, and read them in the hearing of all, and asked if hee had not truly written? and all assented he had: Then hee proceeded thus.) I doubt not sir, but you haue learned Logick, and doe knowe that the definition of a thing doth expresse the whole essence, and that what a man defines a thing to be, that he holds to be the essence of it: Tell me here doe you not grant this?

Mr. Smith. *I doe.*

Mr. *Walker.*

Well then, it must be granted, that Doctor *whitaker* doth hold that to be the essence of the Church which he doth comprehend in the definition of the Church. Now his definition of the Church is,

Cœlus

Cœtus electorum & fidelium, A company of elect and faithfull men, and he proues against *Bellarmine*, that none can be seene with the eye to be members of the Catholike Church, because the elect onely faithfull and godly, belong to it, whose graces are inuisible, and not hypocrites and reprobates, as *Bellarmine* doth hold. Dare you deny this?

Mr. Smith.

I am sure he holds as I said before, that the whole essence of the Church consists in true preaching of Gods word, and in administration of the Sacraments.

Mr. *Walker*.

Because I will not spend time in contesting with you; let this be the issue before these Gentlemen: let vs send for Doctor *Whitakers* workes, and if I doe not shew that he doth proue against *Bellarmine*, that the Catholike Church is inuisible, and that this is a maine point largely disputed by him, and a maine controuersie betweene him and *Bellarmine*, let mee be branded with the marke of a wilfull lyer, impostore and false prophet. But if I shew it presently before them all out of his owne writings, then shall you confesse your selfe a forger and falsifier, an impostor, and a priest of *Baal*; The Gentlemen all confessed that this was faire play, and desired it might bee so. Whereupon Mr. *Smith* began to draw backe, and shewed himselfe vnwilling, and much affraid to hazard his credit so quickly, and would gladly haue left this point, and fallen into another, But Mr. *Walker* proceeded on this wise and said: Gentlemen it is true, that Doctor *Whitakers* maintaines, that the Word truly preached, and the

Sacraments rightly administred, are the certaine and infallible notes and markes, by which euery true particular Church may be discerned to bee Christs true church: and you know that the markes of a thing differ from the essence and substance of it: as the signe hanging at the dore of a Tauerne, and shewing that house to be a Tauerne, differs from the Tauerne it selfe: and the habit and Cowle of a Monke or Frier, which is the marke of his order, differs from the Monke himselfe, and is not any part of his essence. I beseech you therefore take notice of the boldnesse and impudency of popish Priests, how they can snatch here and there a speech out of our learned mens writings, without any vnderstanding of it, and thereby make show, as if they had throughly read those Authors; yea, and can in common talke, and in titles of their printed pamphlets professe, that they haue confuted *Whitakers*, *Reignolds*, *Field*, *Perkins*, and many others, whose bookes they neuer durst reade throughly, neither haue the hardinesse to sift any of their maine arguments. I assure you, that as you see this which I say here verefied, so I finde it a common thing among them all.

Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith *and all his company on his side were very vnwilling to insist any longer vpon this point, and therfore answered nothing; but presently proceeded to anothe question, and asked* Mr. *Walker* Whether the whole militant Church on earth may erre?

Mr. *Walker*.

I answer, that this question is captious and ambiguous,

ambiguous, and cannot directly in one word negatiue or affirmatiue bee answered : my reasons are these; First, because the whole militant Church, if such a Church may be acknowledged, is nothing but the whole number of particuler Churches militant on earth; and in diuers points they doe differ among themselues : and it is as impossible for any man to finde out the iudgement of them all in euery point, as it is impossible to gather them all at once into one place. Secondly, it may bee said both that it may erre, and also that it cannot erre in diuers respects and considerations, if wee consider it by it selfe alone, as it is militant, and according to the militancy and weakenesse of it (as I may so speake) we grant that it may erre, and in euery particular part of it, there may bee found some errors : but if we consider it according vnto the relation and dependance which it hath vpon the Triumphant Church, and the assistance which it hath from Christ, his Prophets and Apostles, vpon whose doctrine and Scriptures it doth wholly cast it selfe, and builds all the doctrines of faith, so it cannot erre, for in so doing it doth follow infallible guides: euen as the Apostle saith of a man regenerate and borne of God, that he cannot sinne, 1 *Ioh.* 3. to wit, in the maine, against the maine precepts of the Gospell, *Beleeue* and *Repent*, for he cannot fall into impenitency and infidelity, because the seede of God, euen his holy Spirit abides in him: But that he hath sinne, and doth lye if he saith he hath none, to wit, through infirmity and weakenesse of the flesh: So likewise it is truly said of the true Church, and

euery

euery part thereof, that as it builds onely on the Scriptures, and doth vrge no doctrine of faith of neceſſity to be beleeued, but ſuch as the Scriptures teach: So it cannot erre no more then the Scripture, for this is a work of infallible faith. But becauſe all men liuing in the Church; haue as infirmities of life, ſo imperfections in iudgement, and ſome peruerſneſſe in affections, and therefore may faile in conceiuing ſome doubtfull and obſcure places of Scripture amiſſe, or in cleauing not ſo cloſe to the word as they ought, or following their owne affections to much, as we ſee in all the writings of the Fathers, and in the moſt part of the generall Councells, in this reſpect we truly ſay, that the Church militant may erre.

Mr. Smith.

You doe what you can to keepe off, and not to come to the point; but I will bring you to it doe what you can if you will anſwer me this queſtion. Whether the whole militant Church of England may erre?

Mr. *Walker.*

I anſwer to this as before, that it is a captious and ambiguous confuſed queſtion, and that this militant Church as the reſt may erre and not erre, according to the former diuers reſpects and conſiderations.

Mr. Smith.

Whether is the Church of England *ſo tyed to the word of God, and ſuch helps, that it cannot erre nor miſinterpret the Scriptures in fundamentall points of Faith?*

Mr. *Walker.*

I anſwer, that as in all other particular Churches

ſo in the particular Churches of *England*, there is a double voice, one of the Church, as ſhe is the true Church of Chriſt, and that is both her voice commending the Scriptures, onely to be beleeued as neceſſary for ſauing knowledge and true faith, and alſo the voice of God plainely ſpeaking in the Scriptures, in this reſpect ſhe is ſo tyed that ſhee cannot erre. There is another voice which the Church vttereth not immediately from her ſelfe, by the Commiſſion which Chriſt gaue vnto her; but by her fraile members, ſuppoſe a Synode and aſſembly of Paſtors taking vpon them to determine things doubtfull out of obſcure places of Scripture, and to make them more plaine then the Scriptures doe vpon which they build; This voice may erre, and by it the Church may be ſaid after a ſort to erre in ſome part, though not wholly nor finally, nor obſtinatly: becauſe if it bee a true Church, it will not abſolutely and peremptorily determine that, which the Scriptures leaue doubtfull: neither will it perſiſt alwaies in the errors if they be deadly, but either the whole number, or at leaſt ſome in the number of the Church will renounce it; and ſo the whole ſhall not erre finally. This is my anſwer; But becauſe I would giue you ſome ground whereon to faſten, that we may not ſpend time in queſtions, but may come to diſputation, which is the intent of our meeting: I will grant you thus much, that the Church of *England* may erre for a time, and after ſome manner in a point fundamentall or neceſſary to ſaluation. Ground what you can vpon this, and let vs haue ſome diſputation by way of

ſtrict Arguments and Syllogiſmes.

Mr. Smith.

I haue enough now out of your owne confeſſion to proue that you haue neither Church nor Faith. And I pray you Gentlemen to marke and take notice, hee grants that the Proteſtant Church of England *may erre in a fundamentall point; now if in one, then as well in another, and ſo from one to another till it erre in all, and ſo haue no faith at all, and hauing no faith it is no Church. Thus you ſee I haue proued that Proteſtants haue neither Church nor Faith: and therefore I beſeech you all take heed of them, who by their owne confeſſion haue forſaken the Catholike Church and faith, and doe wilfully runne into all damnable errors and hereſies, and lead men into deſtruction. You ſee how plainely they are conuinced; and I appeale to you all, iudge whether I haue not plainely proued that which I did vndertake, to wit, that they haue neither Church nor Faith, and ſo are in a moſt damnable eſtate.*

Mr. *Walker.*

To theſe words vttered, with great vehemency and action of the hands and whole body, Mr. *Walker* ſtanding vp, and putting off his Hat made this reply: Firſt (ſaith he) though it was your motion, and my deſire, that we might argue mildly without bitter words: yet ſeeing you firſt breake out ſo vnreaſonably, and goe about by bitter and reproachfull words and geſtures to beare downe the truth: I muſt craue leaue of theſe Gentlemen to anſwer you in your kinde, though it be very vnſeemly, that in my manner of anſwer, you may behold the vnſeemelineſſe of your diſputing: and then with like words, voice, and geſtures, he anſwered to this effect:

effect: First, whereas you say that you haue proued, that which you did vndertake: you shew your selfe without wit or reason: for you are not able to bring one word of reason by way of argument, till I doe lay you a ground, as all here doe see; and therefore if you seeme to proue any thing, you must thanke me for it, who doe yeeld more then you can proue: Secondly, your argument is without all forme, order, or reason; for it doth not follow, that euery Church which may erre in one point, may erre in all points at once, and fall wholly away, because God hath promised, that the gates of Hell shall not preuaile against his Church so farre, as to put it quite from the foundation, though it may build stubble and strawe vpon the foundation, by erring in some points for a time. Thirdly, though it bee not impossible for the true Church to erre, yea, though it were granted that it might wholly fall away from all faith: yet it doth not thereupon follow that it doth so, and that now presently it hath no faith, neither is a Church at all: Thus Gentlemen (you see) how I haue proued this man by his owne speech to bee without wit, reason, modestie, or honesty, roauing without wit or reason, railing without modesty, and falsely charging vs against all show of honesty: But I feare me that this kinde of Frier-like preaching, is odious and distastfull to all iudicious beholders: I pray you let vs dispute orderly, and according to art: And if you be able to dispute Scholler-like, let vs haue one argument framed into a short Syllogism.

Mr. Smith.

I warrant you I can make Syllogismes to your small comfort.

Mr. *Walker.*

And I doubt not but I ſhall as eaſily anſwer them to your ſmall eaſe.

Mr. *Smith.*

Then he with much adoe vtterred this Syllogiſme, and cauſed it to be written downe. That Church which hath not the word of God truely preached, and infallibly deliuered vnto it, is not the true Church of Chriſt: But the Proteſtant Church is ſuch. *Ergo.*

Mr. *Walker.*

I diſtinguiſh vpon the Maior propoſition: For if you meane the word truly preached, and infallibly deliuered in euery particular point, ſo that it can neuer erre any manner of way in any ſuch point. I denie the *Maior* vpon example and warrant from the Apoſtles: and doe hold that a true Church may for a time haue the word not truly deliuered, and infallibly in ſome point, and yet be a true Church: But if you vnderſtand a totall erring in all points, and a preaching of the whole word vntruly: then is your *Minor* moſt falſe, for Proteſtant Churches doe not preach the whole word vntruly at any time. Now proue you which of your propoſitions you pleaſe: For in theſe ſenſes which I haue named both are falſe.

Mr. Smith.

The Maior *is ſo manifeſt that it needs no proofe, neither can be denyed, for how is it poſſible for any Church to be a true Church which hath not the word truly preached in all points.*

Mr. *Walker.*

It is to me a manifeſt vntruth, and therefore proue

it true if you can; if you cannot, then yeeld the cauſe, that is falſe.

Mr. Smith.

I proue it thus. That Church which hath not the word of God truly preached, but falſely tranſlated, is no true Church. Such is the Church of England. Ergo.

M. *Walker.*

This is no proofe of that propoſition which I denyed, and which you did vndertake to proue, and therefore you ſhew your ſelfe ignorant in diſputing and doe commit that fallacy againſt the rules of Logicke which we call *Ignorationem elenchi.*

Mr. Smith.

It is a true Syllogiſme, and proues the maine matter in controuerſie, to wit, that you haue no true Church.

Mr. *Walker.*

But the thing which you were to proue, was that the Church which hath not Gods word truly preached, and infallibly deliuered in euery point at all times, is not a true Church. This becauſe you cannot tell how to proue as you did vndertake, therefore you flee to another new Argument, to which alſo I doe anſwer, as I did to the former: Firſt, that the *Maior* propoſition is falſe: For a Church which hath the word of God falſely or erroneouſly tranſlated in ſome parts, and ſo not truely preached in euery part, may be a true Church. Secondly, if you meane falſely tranſlated, and not truly preached of purpoſe and wilfully, then the *Minor* is falſe, for though the tranſlation of the Church of *England* may faile and miſſe of the true meaning of diuers places, (as all the beſt tranſlations, eſpecially the

vulgar Latine approued by the Romiſh Church doth,) yet it is not ſo erroneouſly tranſlated of purpoſe, neither doe all the Preachers thereof build certainly on ſuch erronious and falſe tranſlations, but many doe diſcerne them, and preach and teach the true oppoſitions; and the Church alloweth them ſo to doe, when they ſhew good reaſons for their doing, from the circumſtances of the text.

Mr. Smith.

But I will ſhew plainely by diuers examples, that you haue diuers places of Scripture falſely tranſlated in your tranſlation of ſet purpoſe, and wilfully contrary to the words of the Hebrew text, contrary alſo to the Greeke and Latine, receiued in all ages and Churches heretofore.

Mr. *Walker.*

You threaten largely in words which are but winde; but indeed you can neuer performe that which you ſay. Let vs ſee, if you be able to ſhew any part of our tranſlation, where in one word, is falſely tranſlated of purpoſe: I deſire no more but to ioyne a cumbat with you hand to hand about the Hebrew text, and about the truth of our tranſlation, and the agreement of it with the originall.

Mr. Smith.

I ſhall quickly proue what I ſay, and what you require. Firſt, I haue a plaine example, Malachi 2.7. *where your tranſlators reade the words thus,* The Prieſts lippes ſhould keepe knowledge, and they ſhould ſeeke the Law at his mouth. *Firſt this tranſlation is falſe, becauſe it is contrary to the Hebrew text; wherein the words are Iiſhmeru* they ſhall keep, *and Iebakſhu* they ſhall ſeek: *and not,* they ſhould keepe, *nor,* they ſhould ſeeke.

Alſo

Also it is contrary to the Greeke, wherein the words are, φυλαξετας *and* ἐκζητήσουσιν, *and to the Latine translation of St.* Hierome, *which is,* Custodient, *and* requirent. *Secondly, it teacheth heresie and false doctrine, namely, that Gods Priests, and they who sit in* Moses *Chaire, may erre, contrary to the words of Christ, who commands his Disciples to heare all such as sit in* Moses *Chaire, because they shall not erre, but their lips shall preserue knowledge. Thirdly, it is thus corrupted of purpose, to gainsay the infallibilitte of the Pastors of the Church, who doe succeed in the chaire of the Apostles; and to blinde the peoples eyes, that they may not see the certainety and infallibility of iudgement in the Priests and Pastors, which sit in* Moses *Chaire, and how they are bound to seeke the Law at their mouth: but may follow any vpstart teachers, which seperate from the Catholike Church. Thus you see Gentlemen all, how plainely I haue proued, that the Church of* England *hath of purpose corrupted the Scriptures, and therefore is no true Church.*

Mr. *Walker.*

Indeed if that which you say were true, you did speake something to the purpose; but great words and protestations cannot make truth to be falshood, nor falshood truth, as for the example which you cite out of our English translation *Mal.* 2.7. I deny it to be contrary to the Hebrew text: yea I will easily proue both from the Hebrew words, which you haue here shewed in the Hebrew Interlinear Bible, and also from the whole scope, and all circumstances of the place, that the English is the best translation, & more perfect then either the Greek or Latine. First, though the Hebrew words *Iishmeru* & *Iebakshu*

be

be of the Futuretenſe, yet this doth not proue: that they ſhould be tranſlated ſo in our tongue, becauſe you cannot but know, if you haue any skill in the Hebrew tongue, that the future tenſe in Hebrewe ſometime ſimply, and ſometime by meanes of *Vau conuerſiue* ſignifies time, either perfectly or imperfectly paſt; ſometimes it ſtands for the Optatiue, Potentiall, and Subiunctiue moode; therefore our tranſlation is not differēt nor irregular from the Hebrew which is the originall. Secondly, it was neuer the purpoſe of Gods ſpirit in that place, or by theſe words to teach, that the Lawe ſhould alwaies bee taught truly and infallibly by the Prieſts and Paſtors who ſucceed *Moſes*, or the Apoſtles locally in the Church by a continued ſucceſſion: for that is a falſhood contrary to the experience of all ages: this very place confutes it moſt euedently; For the Prieſts vnto whom the Prophet here ſpeaks in theſe places were Leuites, and ſucceeded *Aaron* in the Prieſthood: and yet they were departed out of the way, *they cauſed many to fall in the Law by their corrupt gloſſe, and their abuſe of the Couenant of Leui.* As it appeares in the next words immediatly following: yea ſome of them had ſacrificed to *Idolls*, as *Ioſephus* ſhewes in his Hiſtory of thoſe times, and therfore the Lord threatens to corrupt their ſeed by cutting off the male progeny, and *to caſt the dung of their Sacrifice in their faces*: ſo that the Prieſthood of *Phineas* ſhould by a ſiſter married into the Tribe of *Iudath* to one of *Dauids* line fall to Chriſt, who deſcended of her, and he ſhould take it away to himſelfe for euer, as is intimated in the 3. verſe of the

ſame

ſame Chapter. So then it is no hereſie but Gods holy truth, that Prieſts ſucceeding in the place and office of *Aaron* and *Moſes* may erre and haue erred: *Moſes* his Chaire in which the Scribes and Phariſies did ſit, was the ſeat wherein they were wont to reade the law of *Moſes*, and the expoſitions of the Prophets to the people, and therefore what they there did teach was true, and Chriſt commanded his Diſciples to obey it: But in their owne gloſſes and traditions they erred damnably, and made voyd Gods Law, and their Doctrine our Sauiour called ſowre leauen, and warned his Diſciples to beware of it. Thirdly, they who tranſlate the words thus: *The Prieſts lippes ſhall keepe knowledge, and they ſhall ſeeke the Law at his mouth:* Did neuer intend to ſhew thereby, that God did make here a promiſe, that ſo it ſhall be for euer: but onely to ſhew that this is the Law and Commandement of God, teaching what the Prieſts and people ſhould doe and ought to doe, euen as in the Commandement, *Thou ſhalt haue no other Gods but me.* The words doe not promiſe, that *the Iſraelites ſhould alwaies acknowledge and worſhip Iehouah the true God alone,* (for the euent ſhewed the contrary within 40. dayes) but ſhewe what they ought to doe; but the words are a commandement recited, not a promiſe made, the words of the 4. verſe ſhew. Therefore our Engliſh tranſlation is moſt perfect of all, ſhewing not onely the ſenſe and meaning of the Law, but alſo how it did binde the Prieſts and people, and how they ought to obey it. Thus you ſee how your example doth make for vs againſt your ſelfe.

Math. 15. 3 16. 12.

Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith *finding worse ſucceſſe then hee expected in this example, and perceiuing the ſtanders by to bee well ſatisfied with this anſwer, flees preſently to another, to wit,* Dan. 4. 27, *where in our Engliſh tranſlation the words run thus.* Breake off thy ſins by righteouſneſſe, and thine iniquities by ſhewing mercy to the poore : *Heere ſaith he the word in the Caldee, which is the originall* Perok *ſignifies to* Redeeme, *and ſo the Greek and Latine tranſlations render it; but your tranſlations of purpoſe contrary to all the auncient receiued tranſlators, and to the nature of the word in the originall doe tranſlate it,* Breake off, *and that of purpoſe to oppoſe the true doctrine of ſatisfaction and merit by good workes. Therefore your Church is a falſe Church.*

Mr. *Walker.*

Howſoeuer other tranſlations run, I am ſure our Engliſh is in ſenſe moſt ſound and orthodox. That tranſlation which counſels *Nabuchadnezar* to redeeme his ſinnes by righteouſneſſe is (as the words doe run) ſenſeleſſe and againſt all reaſon; For God neuer appointed that mens ſinnes ſhould bee redeemed; but his will is, that they ſhould bee mortified and deſtroyed, and he ſo hates them, that he cannot leaue them vnpuniſhed, but will haue iuſt vengeance to be executed for them, either vpon the ſinner himſelfe, or on his ſurety. If you vnderſtand the words (as you ſeeme to vrge them) that *Nabuchadnezar* a wicked heathen King, ſhould by his own righteouſneſſe redeeme himſelfe from his ſins; you doe make *Daniel* a teacher of hereſie and blaſphemie: for it is no leſſe then blaſphemy, to hold

that

that an Idolatrous Pagan may by his owne righteousneſſe redeeme himſelfe: it makes voide the promiſe of Chriſt the Redeemer. But our Engliſh tranſlation doth teach excellent truth; to wit, that a true conuert ought not onely to beleeue in Chriſt, and by faith to put on the robe of his righteouſnes, that therein he may appeare righteous before God, and comely in his ſight; but alſo to breake off his ſinfull courſe of life, and neuer to goe on any longer in any knowne ſinne, as Papiſts doe, in hope of abſolution by confeſſion and pennance. And therefore I doubt not, but the word in the originall will be more agreeable to our tranſlation, when we come to ſee and examine it, if you be pleaſed to let me ſee your Hebrew Bible.

Mr. Smith.

Loe here in the originall the word is in the Caldee Perok *which ſignifies onely to redeeme,* λυτρωσαι, *as the Greeke tranſlation renders it: and the Latine Redeeme.*

Mr. *Walker.*

I thought that we ſhould finde it thus, when wee came to the triall; dare you here before theſe Gentlemen put on ſuch an impudent face, as to affirme without feare or ſhame, that this *Parak* ſignifies onely to redeeme and nothing elſe?

Mr. Smith.

I confeſſe it ſignifies alſo to breake in ſunder: but neuer to breake off.

Mr. *Walker.*

Yea, it ſignifies all kinde of breaking, euen breaking aſunder, breaking in pieces, and breaking off; for indeed it is an Hebrew word, and the Caldee

borrowes it from the Hebrew, the first and most proper signification of it, is to breake asunder, or to breake off: and it doth signifie to Redeeme onely in a trope by a metominie of the cause for the effect, for men are redeemed out of bondage, by hauing their yoke of bondage broken off from their neck, and their chaines and fetters broken in sunder, and that that breaking is the meanes of their Redemption: That it signifies properly to breake off, appeares by the common vse of it in the Scriptures, as *Gen.* 27. 40. where *Isaac* saith to *Esau*, *Thou shalt breake off his yoke from thy necke*; *Exod.* 32.2. where *Aaron* said to the people, *Breake off the golden eare-rings, which are in the eares of your wiues, &c.* Thus Gentlemen you see what a bold face this man can set vpon a falshood, and how he goeth about to beare downe the truth with great words.

Sir *Edward Harwood.*

Vpon this Sir *Edward Harwood* stood vp and said, that Mr. *Smith* had failed much in this proofe, seeing the word in the originall did beare another sense more proper, then that which he vrged for the onely true sense. And that the proper sense which the English translation did follow, being so agreeable to the rule of faith was rather to be embraced.

Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith *thus confounded had no shift but this: That the Hebrew text was by the malice of the Iews corrupted in many things, and that it was written of old without pricks, vntill the Iewish Massorites did inuent prickes and vowels, by which we doe reade it, diuers hundreds of yeeres after Christ: And therefore he would not build any*

naturall

naturall point on the originall Hebrew wôrds.

Mr. *Walker.*

Now (saith Mr. *Walker*) you shew your selfe what you are in your owne colours, euen one who esteemes no authority or testimony either of God or man, further then they serue your owne turne: while you imagined that the Hebrew text was against our translation, you did vrge it with great vehemency, as the authority and testimony of God. Now when it failes you and contrary to your expectation doth make for vs: you vilifie it and reiect it, as a thing corrupted by the Iewes, and formed according to the minde and pleasure of the Iewish Massorites: wherein you shew not onely vanity of minde and inconstancy: but also malice and wickednesse ioyned with wilfull ignorance. For howsoeuer *Elias Leuita* a turnecoate Iew of later times, may seeme to affirme such a thing (perhaps to please his Patrone *Aegidius*) that the vowels were inuented by the Massorites of *Tiberias*: yet it is the iudgement of all the best learned, both Iewish Rabbins and Christians, that the pricks, vowels, and accents, were from the beginning: And the Massorites were Iewes gathered both out of the East and West of purpose, to compare their most auncient and authentike Manuscripts togither, and when they found them all to agree in letters and points, they made their Massorah, and noted how many times such a word was written with such pricks in the Scripture; how many verses, words, yea letters were in the Law, and which was the middle verse, word and letter, so that by their Massorah, if it had beene kept

perfect, a man might finde out, if there were but one word, letter, or pricke altered or taken away out of all the old Testament. All the differences which were found betweene the Bibles of the Easterne and Westerne Iewes are recorded and kept to this day, the one set downe vnder the names of the sonnes of *Ashur*, the other vnder the names of the sonnes of *Nephtali*, and they are such as doe not alter the sense at all, as may be seene in all our great Rabbinicall Bibles; The end therefore of the Massarites meeting, and of their worke, was not to inuent vowels and pricks, but onely to note how they did finde the Scriptures pricked and vowelled from the dayes of old, and to set downe rules for the knowledge thereof, and for the preseruing of them without alteration or corruption to all posterities: Thus much I haue learned out of the Rabbins, though my skill be but small in their language, and though I haue had no time to spend in the study of them, but such as I haue stollen from my other necessary studies of Diuinity, which properly concerne my calling. And if you know not this to be true, I am sure you are but a weake Hebrutian, and slenderly read in Hebrew Rabbins.

Mr. Smith.

All the Rabbins are of opinion, that the pricks of the Bible were inuented by the Massarites, and vndoubtedly, that opinion is the truth.

Mr. *Walker.*

I pray you name one Rabbin of note, who is of that opinion, and I will name you ten of the contrary; I haue ten or twelue of the best Rabbin Comen-

taries

taries vpon the Law of *Moſes*, which I will ſhew to you, and if you can ſinde any of them to be of that opinion, I will yeeld vnto you in this point. Nay more then that, I will ſhew out of the Scriptures written by *Moſes*, that the originall Scriptures of *Moſes* his Law, which were kept in the Tabernacle by the Prieſts were written, not ſingle without pricks as common copies were, but double, both with letters and pricks, ſo that none could doubt of the right reading of them.

Mr. Smith.

It is eaſily ſaid; but impoſſible to be proued, if you can ſhew me any ſuch thing out of the Scriptures, you ſhall do more then any euer yet could doe.

Mr. *Walker.*

Looke *Deut.* 17.18. and there it is plainely teſtified, that there was a booke of the Law appointed to be kept before the Prieſts and Leuites in the Sanctuary, out of which, the King was commanded to write him a double written copie of the Law, that is, a copie written both with letters and pricks, and ſo moſt eaſie to be read and vnderſtood, for the Hebrew word there vſed is *Miſhneh* which ſignifies Double, and ſo you ſee here in your interliniall Bible *Pagani* doth tranſlate it (*Duplum legis.*) that is, the Law written in the double forme, both with letters and pricks.

Another Prieſt.

Mr. Smith *being confounded with this proofe, could anſwer nothing, and therfore another Prieſt who did ſit by to aſſiſt him, anſwered for him, that the Hebrew word Miſhneh doth not ſignifie the originall Scriptures, but*

the

the exposition of the Rabbins upon the text of Scripture.

Mr. *Walker.*

It is true that the Rabbins call their expositions somtimes by this name, as for example *Rabbi Moses, Maymonides* calls his Summe of the *Talmid, Mishueh Torah:* But you must know that in *Moses* his dayes, when he wrote this booke of *Deuteronomy*, there were no Rabbinicall Commentaries, nor for a thousand yeares after; onely the Law it selfe was kept before the Priests, and the King was commanded to write it only into a booke; There *Mishueh* cannot here signifie any thing, but the Text of the Lawe written in double forme, which double forme of writing was easie to be read and vnderstood, and was as an exposition in respect of the single writing without pricks. Whereupon this word *Mishueh* came to signifie an exposition or Commentary which doth largely expresse the meaning of the Law, which is more short and obscure: and the Iewes doe call by this name the booke of *Deuteronomy*, because it is an exposition of the Lawes written more obscurely in the other bookes: And their expositions of the Law set downe in their *Talmud:* they also call *Mishueh* and *Mishnaioth:*

Priest.

The word Mishneh *doth not signifie properly the Scripture, but the doubled Law: for the Scripture is called* Mickra *in the Hebrew tongue.*

Mr. *Walker.*

The Law is the first Scripture which was written, and therefore the word *Mishueh* by your owne confession, signifying the Law doubled, it is written in

double

double forme, ſignifies the Scripture written both with letters and pricks, and ſo you contradict your ſelfe in your ſpeech : Whereas you alleage another name, by which the Hebrews call the Scripture, to wit, *Mickra*, and from them would inferre, that the Scripture is neuer called *Miſhueh* by them: I anſwer, that your reaſon is rediculous, for one name of the Scripture doth not take away the reſt, but it hath diuers names in all languages: wee in Engliſh call it the *Scripture*, and the Bible, and the booke of God, and Gods word: So in Hebrew the Scripture is called by diuers names; ſometimes *Torah*, that is the Law, becauſe it it the rule of Life ſometimes *Chethab*, *The Scripture or writing*, becauſe it is written. Sometimes *Mickra*, becauſe it is read of all Gods people. And as it is written full and plaine in letters and pricks, it is called *Miſhueh*. The Prieſt hauing nothing to reply to this Anſwer, but holding his peace, Some of the Gentlemen deſired, that theſe diſputations about the Hebrewe text, which they could not vnderſtand might ceaſe, and that Mr. *Smith* would diſpute in plaine Engliſh by way of Syllogiſmes; To which motion both parties agreed. And ſo Mr. *Smith* proceeded to another Argument, which was written downe firſt, and then anſwered. *Mr.* Smith.

That Church which may erre for a time in a fundamentall point neceſſary to ſaluation is no true Church. Yours is ſuch.

Mr. *Walker*.

I deny your propoſition; for a true Church may ſo erre for a time.

Mr. Smith.

That Chnrch which may erre for a time in a fundamentall point neceſſary to ſaluation hath no certainty for that time, yours is ſuch, Ergo, *it is no true Church.*

Mr. *Walker.*

Your Argument is Sophiſticall and faulty diuers waies: Firſt, it doth not proue the propoſition which I denyed, and ſo it is a fallacy, which wee call ἄγνοιαν ἐλγχυ, *Ignorationem Elanchi.* Secondly, it is no true Syllogiſme, becauſe it hath foure tearmes. For the premiſſes tend to proue that our Church hath no certainty, and yon conclude otherwiſe: to wit, that it is no true Church. Thirdly, the propoſition is falſe, for actuall erring in one point, doth not take away certainty in all the reſt, much leſſe poſſibility of erring for a time.

Mr. Smith.

I proue it thus. That Church which may erre for a time in a fundamentall point neceſſary to ſaluation, hath not ſufficient meanes of ſaluation for that time: yours is ſuch Ergo, *it is no true Church.*

Mr. *Walker.*

Here are the ſame three faults, which were in your former Argument. Firſt, no proofe of the propoſition denyed. Secondly, foure tearmes. Thirdly the manner is ſtill falſe: for poſſibility of erring doth not take away ſufficiency of meanes for the time.

Mr. Smith.

I proue it thus. That Church which may erre for a time in a fundamentall point neceſſary to ſaluation, for that time hath not the whole infallible faith requiſite to ſaluation.

ſaluation. But your Church may ſo erre: Ergo. *It hath not the whole infallible faith requiſite for ſaluation.*

Mr. *Walker.*

I ſee you cannot bring one argument to proue that which I denyed, but ſtill you doe begin a new Argument to proue new things. Notwithſtanding I will follow you whereſoeuer you goe; and therefore I deny the *maior*, and doe require you to proue that poſſibility of erring, takes away the whole infallible faith from ſuch as are ſubiect to it.

Mr. Smith.

I proue it thus. The beliefe of the whole infallible faith, is a meanes neceſſary to ſaluation. The Engliſh Church hath not the whole infallible faith: Ergo. That Church which may erre for a time in a fundamentall point, *for that time hath not meanes ſufficient.*

Mr. *Walker.*

Now ſir I ſee you baue loſt the queſtion, and your reaſon, and your ſelfe, and all your ſpeech is a Chaos without forme or figure, and proueth nothing at all: If you be not able to make a Syllogiſme; I pray you confeſſe your weakeneſſe: and let mee diſpute one of my queſtions againſt you, and let vs trie what faculty you haue in defending your cauſe; I am ſure you haue none to any purpoſe in oppoſing it.

Mr. Smith.

Stay a little, and I will bring it into a Syllogiſme preſently. The whole intire, infallible faith in all fundamentall points, is only a meanes ſufficient to ſaluation: That Church which may erre for a time in a fundamentall point, hath not the whole infallible faith:

Ergo : *it hath not ſufficient meanes, &c.*

Mr. *Walker.*

You cloy me with craſie Syllogiſmes which haue neither mood nor figure, and which tend to proue nothing but onely to repeat what hath beene before denyed; to wit, That poſſibility of erring for a time in a fundamentall point, doth depriue a Church of the whole infallible faith. Thus you bring in againe as your *minor*, though it hath before beene denyed: and therefore I will ſtill put you to proue it. But I pray you let your aſſiſtant write downe your Syllogiſmes, for I am weary of writing, and of waſting paper with falſe fallacies and confuſed ſpeeches, which hath neither mood nor figure.

Mr. Smith.

I am ſure I ſhall quickly bring my Argument into forme, if you ſtand ſo ſtrictly on artificiall Syllogiſmes: Hauing thus ſaid, he aroſe from the table, as if he would breathe himſelfe; and after much ſcratching of his head, and other geſtures, he turnes to the Prieſt his aſſiſtant and bids him write: and did dictate vnto him another falſe Syllogiſme of ſome tearmes: which Mr. Walker *reiected and derided; And after that another, which was ſo reiected: And after that a third, and ſo on till he had ſpent a ſide of a leafe in* folio *in writing downe fallacies, and a large halfe houre and more of time.*

So that Mr *Walker* began to intreat him that hee would giue him leaue to make his Syllogiſme for him, for he perceiued what he intended.

Whereat Mr. Smith *chafed, and ſaid to the Gentlemen, he confounds me, or elſe I could haue long agoe brought it into a Syllogiſme.*

Mr. *Walker.*

Mr. *Walker* answered: you doe me wrong to attribute to mee the honour which belongs to God and his truth, for they confound you and not I.

Then one of the Roman Catholikes began to sweare by God, that Mr. Smith *did make a true Syllogisme, which* Mr. Walker *had without cause reiected.*

Mr. *Walker* desired him to repeat it, and to shew it to be regular, according to moode and figure.

The Roman Catholike swore againe diuers great oathes, and said that he would take the Sacrament vpon it, and renounce his saluation if hee did not heare Mr. Smith *make a true Syllogisme, and that one of them which* Mr. Walker *reiected was it.*

Mr. *Walker* answered, that oathes could not proue false syllogismes to be true, neither could the Sacrament turne a fallacy into a sound Argument. And told him that if he were so prodigall of his saluation, he might sooner lose his soule, then make a Syllogisme out of Mr. *Smiths* confused speeches and fallacies. At length after much adoe Mr. *Smith* hammered out this Syllogisme.

Mr. Smith.

That Church which hath not the whole intire infallible faith, hath not meanes sufficient to saluation. That Church which may erre for a time, hath not the whole intire infallible faith, Ergo, *it hath not means sufficient.*

M. *Walker.*

I deny your *minor*, and doe put you to proue, that the Church which may erre, hath not the whole infallible faith.

Mr. Smith.

I proue it thus: That Church which is subiect to error,

hath not the whole infallible faith. That Church which may erre is ſubiect to error. Ergo.

Mr. *Walker.*

Now ſir I thanke you, that you haue beſtowed a Syllogiſme vpon me, to proue the propoſition denied. But I muſt tell you, that your *maior* propoſition is falſe. For a Church may be ſo far ſubiect to error, that it may haue a poſſibility to erre, and yet not be voide of the whole infallible faith : It is one thing to be ſubiect to error, and another thing to erre actually: we hold that our Church or any other particular Proteſtant Church may erre; but doe not thinke that our Church doth erre in any fundamentall point.

Mr. Smith.

You doe but cauill; for if it may erre it is as bad as if it did erre, and therefore I haue ſufficiently conuinced you by my argument.

Mr. *Walker.*

I hope you doe not ſpeake as you thinke, nor thinke as you ſpeake : For you know that by our Law euery Seminary Prieſt is ſubiect to hanging and quartering, and there is no impoſſibility of executing the Law vpon them ; And yet you hope that all or the moſt part of them in *England* ſhall not be actually executed; and you know that they are not all in the ſame caſe, as if they were hanging actually : For an Argument doth not follow a *poſſe ad eſſe*, as we Schollers ſpeake. But now ſeeing your argument is hanged vp, and we haue ſpent foure houres and more in hearing you diſpute to no purpoſe, I pray you let me proſecute one of my

queſtions

queſtions againſt you for the time which remaineth, and I hope to make more Syllogiſmes in an houre, then you haue done in foure, if you will anſwer me directly.

Here ſome of the Roman Catholikes ſaid that it was full ſixe a clocke, and now there was little time left. But ſome of the Proteſtants deſired to heare Mr.*Walker* diſpute vpon his queſtions. Which when Mr.*Smith* ſeemed loath to yeeld vnto, as being weary already. Mr.*Walker* deſired, that he might but turne one Argument againſt Mr.*Smiths* queſtion, and proue the contrary to be true. To this all aſſented, and the gentleman who began to diſtruſt his former profeſſed popery comming to Mr. *Walker*, and ſtanding at his backe deſired him to preſſe one Argument againſt Mr.*Smiths* queſtion. Whereupon Mr.*Walker* thus began to proue, *that a true Chriſtian Church might erre for a time in ſome fundamentall point, and yet be a true Church.*

Mr.*Walker*.

That which the auncient Apoſtolicall Church might doe other ſucceeding Churches may doe with the ſame ſucceſſe. The Apoſtolicall Church might erre and did erre in a maine point, and yet haue a true faith, and was a true Church, *Ergo*, other Churches alſo.

Mr. *Smith*.

I deny the minor, *the Apoſtolicall Church did not erre in any maine point.*

Mr.*Walker*.

The reſurrection Chriſt from the dead taught in the Scriptures, is a fundamentall point of Faith.

The

The Apoſtolike Church did erre in it, *Ergo*:

Mr. Smith denyed the minor.

Mr. *Walker* proued it thus. That which the Goſpell teacheth in expreſſe words is true. This the Goſpell teacheth, that the Apoſtles erred in Chriſts reſurrection, *Ergo*.

Mr. Smith.

If you ſay that they erred in the reſurrection de facto, *that is concerning act of it, I grant the* minor: *But if you ſpeake of reſurrection as it is a point of Faith I deny your minor.*

Mr. *Walker*.

You diſtinguiſh ſtrangely betweene a thing and it ſelfe; for the very act of Chriſts reſurrection is a point of Faith, without which our faith as vaine as the Apoſtles faith, 1 *Cor*. 15. 17.

Mr. Smith.

It is now a point of faith, but it was not then, becauſe the Scriptures had not expreſſely reuealed, that Chriſt ſhould riſe from death.

Mr. *Walker*.

That which Chriſt had expreſly taught by word of my mouth, was thereby made a point of faith, and they were bound to beleeue. But hee had told them, that he muſt ſuffer and riſe againe the third day: and that in plaine words, as the Goſpell teſtifies, *Ergo*.

Here ſome of the Gentlemen ſaid, that the point was ſufficiently proued.

Mr. Smith.

But I deny that the Apoſtles erred in the Reſurrection: ſhew me that out of the Goſpell.

Mr. *Walker*.

Mr. *Walker*.

It is testified *Ioh.*20.9. *That they knew not the Scripture that he must rise from the dead.* Loe thus it is testified in your owne vulgar Latine Bible.

Mr. Smith.

I say still, that the Scriptures had not reuealed it sufficiently, and therefore it was no point of faith.

Mr. *Walker*.

The text shewes that the Scripture had reuealed, for else how could it truly say that they knew not the Scripture; if the Scripture had not taught it? It is no ignorance of Scripture, not to know what the Scripture neuer taught.

Sir *William Harrington*.

O well said, I protest I neuer heard any point so plainly proued; and then turning himselfe to the wauering Gentleman said: Now cousen, if euer thou wilt bee conuerted, be conuerted with these proofes.

Mr. *Walker*.

But yet I will proue it more fully, *Luke* 24.44.45. Our Sauiour there saith, that hee had told them before, that he must die and rise againe, and that it was written in the Law of *Moses*, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalmes, and it is said there, that he opened their vnderstanding, that they might vnderstand the Scriptures.

Mr. Smith.

This was an error of ignorance or forgetfulnesse, for want of instruction and exercise in the word which succeeding Churches haue more abundantly.

Mr. *Walker*.

You cauill against common sense, for I dispute

not whence this error proceeded, but whether they erred in that maine point of the Resurrection or not; and that you cannot deny, so that the point is fully proued which I vndertooke. Againe, I can shew you yet further, that Christ hauing instructed them in the Scriptures, and from his owne mouth, it could not be for want of instruction that they erred, but this error proceeded from incredulity and hardnesse of heart in them, so it appeares *Mark.* 16. 14. where it is said that our Sauiour appeared to the eleuen Apostles, and *vpbraided them with their incredulity and hardnesse of heart, because they beleeued not them which had seene him after he was risen.*

Another Priest.

Mr. Smith *being put to silence with those proofes, The other Priest to make vp this breach, fled to another shift, and denyed the Apostles to haue beene a Church at that time, because the holy Ghost was not yet come downe, nor the Euangelicall Law reuealed.*

Mr. *Walker.*

Vpon this Mr. *Walker* first spake to the wauering Gentleman, and asked him, whether he thought it not well for him to be of such a Church as *St. Peter* was, when Christ said, *Math.* 16. *Happy art thou Simon, &c.* And, *vpon this rocke I will build my Church.* Who answered, that he desired to be of no better Church. Secondly he proceeded thus; *The kingdome of God which comes by the preaching of the Gospell is the true Church.* But that was come already as our Sauiour himselfe testified, *Math.* 11. 28. and *Luk.* 11. 20. It is a base shift, to say that the comming downe of the holy Ghost made them a Church:

For

For his extraordinary gifts came not to make them Christians, and members of the Church of Christ, but to make them fit messengers to preach to all nations, and to euery people in their proper tongue. But if all this will not conuince you, let vs know who were the Church in those dayes, if the Apostles were not. *Peter* had receiued that commission and promise long before, vpon which you build the Church of *Rome*, if it was not then able to make him of the Church, how can it now vphold your Church against all the gates of hell? Now then to conclude, I beseech you as you loue your soules, take heed of sinning against your owne conscience, and of rebelling against the light: you know that the Apostles were elected from all eternity; they were effectually called by Christ himselfe, not onely to beleeue, and to be Christians and open professors, but also to be Apostles and Preachers, and by the Gospell preached and miracles wroughr, they had conuerted many to the faith, as the Gospel testifieth; And therefore nothing being wanting in them, which is required to the essence of a Christian Church: vndoubtedly they were a true Church, and to deny this, is to resist the manifest truth of the Gospell. Thus the Disputation ended; For the Priests did not giue any answer, but were very willing to make an end. The Protestant Gentlemen seemed well satisfied, & made them ready to depart. And one of the Roman Catholikes calling Mr. *Walker* aside, began to collogue and flatter with him; telling him, that he was a good Logician, a good Linguist, and well read, and that God had giuen

him a ſharpe witte and ready tongue: And therfore no maruell though he preuailed and made a good cauſe ſeeme bad, when he oppoſed it, and a bad ſeeme good when he defended it: But ſaith he, take heed that you doe not truſt to your wit and learning too much, leaſt they deceiue you, and make you triumph ouer the truth.

To him Mr. *Walker* anſwered, that he knew himſelfe inferiour to many hundreds in the Church of *England*; that it was not any power in himſelfe, but the power of the true cauſe which made him to preuaile. For, *Magna eſt veritas & prævalebit, Great is truth and will preuaile.* A Gentleman ouerhearing, laughed and ſaid, I am glad that you finde ſome of our Miniſters more learned then your Prieſts; contrary to your common bragging and boaſting, that all learning is among your Prieſts and Ieſuits. And ſo they parted. Mr. *Smith* alias *Norrice* embracing Mr. *Walker* and ſaying; I pray God we two may meet in heauen; and Mr. *Walker* replying and ſaying, I deſire ſo alſo, and hope we ſhall ſo doe, if you wil forſake your errors and embrace the truth, which is profeſſed in the reformed Churches of Chriſt.

Soli Deo gloria.

FINIS.

17427

C 24960
17427
SL

PHOTOSTAT FACSIMILE

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE

HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION